UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/723,688	11/26/2003	Peter Gaal	030153	8929
	7590 08/05/200 INCORPORATED	EXAMINER		
5775 MOREHO	OUSE DR.		ELCENKO, ERIC J	
SAN DIEGO, CA 92121			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2617	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			08/05/2008	ELECTRONIC

# Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

us-docketing@qualcomm.com kascanla@qualcomm.com nanm@qualcomm.com

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/723,688	GAAL ET AL.	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	ERIC ELCENKO	2617	
The MAILING DATE of this communicate Period for Reply	tion appears on the cover sheet w	ith the correspondence addres	ss
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAIL  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 3 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communic  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statuto  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	LING DATE OF THIS COMMUN. 7 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a cation. by period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MO by statute, cause the application to become A	CATION. reply be timely filed  NTHS from the mailing date of this commu BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status			
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed c	☐ This action is non-final. allowance except for formal mat	• •	erits is
Disposition of Claims			
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-31 and 37-41 is/are pending 4a) Of the above claim(s) 32-36 is/are w 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-31 and 37-41 is/are rejected 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction	vithdrawn from consideration.		
Application Papers			
9) The specification is objected to by the E  10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)  Applicant may not request that any objection  Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the  11) The oath or declaration is objected to by	o accepted or b) objected to n to the drawing(s) be held in abeya e correction is required if the drawing	nce. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). g(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1	, ,
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for a) All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority doc 2. Certified copies of the priority doc 3. Copies of the certified copies of the application from the International * See the attached detailed Office action for	cuments have been received. cuments have been received in A he priority documents have beer Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	Application No n received in this National Sta	ge
Attachment(s)  1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  Paper No(s)/Mail Date	.948) Paper No	Summary (PTO-413) (s)/Mail Date Informal Patent Application 	

Application/Control Number: 10/723,688 Page 2

Art Unit: 2617

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

## Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The applicant argues the combination does not teach or suggest "assigning a second sub-code derived from the first code to support a supplemental channel to the second subscriber station." The examiner respectfully disagrees. The code tree as seen in Fig. 2. shows how codes are derived from higher codes. Lindskog goes on to disclose selecting codes for allocation depending on rate needed. Paragraphs 25-30 go into greater detail of the different codes from the code tree as seen in Fig. 2 and explained below in the current action. The applicant also argues Lindskog does not disclose assigning more than one channel with different Walsh codes. The claimed subject matter does not mention directly using different Walsh codes, only different codes. Taken in its broadest general interpretation, codes does not limit the claimed subject matter to Walsh codes.

### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

2. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claims 39-41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claims 39-41 contain wording that is non-statutory and related to material in the specification that is directed at non-statutory material. Appropriate correction is required.

Application/Control Number: 10/723,688 Page 3

Art Unit: 2617

# Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

- (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- Claims 1-31 and 37-41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lindskog (U.S. Pub. No. 2006/0120322) in view of Scherzer et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,901,062)

In regard to Claims 1, 7, 14, 16, 19, 25-26 and 37-41, Lindskog teaches allocating a first code to a first subscriber station, (*A request comes in for allocation of channel resources, and a specific channel resources is allocated, Abs*) Assigning a first sub-code derived from the first code to support a dedicated channel to the first subscriber station,(*depending upon the rate needed, a code is broken down as shown in Fig. 2 into smaller sub-codes of the larger code to maximize the resources available., <i>Para 25-27*) This process can be done for multiple mobile stations. Assigning a second sub-code derived from the first code to support a supplemental channel to the second subscriber station. (*depending upon the rate needed, the allocation may contain multiple codes from the tree as shown in Fig. 2. from which more than one sub-code would be allocated to maximize the resources. Different size codes from different parent codes would be used, making them multiple codes. Para 28,30,37 and 44)* 

Lindskog does not directly disclose a second mobile station. While it is obvious that more than 1 mobile station would be present in a communication system, Scherzer is cited for a direct reference to multiple mobile stations.

Scherzer teaches grouping the subscriber stations in a number of groups (e.g., M groups) and allocating resources to subscriber stations in groups. (Col 9, Ln 33-55)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Lindskog to include the teaching of Scherzer in order for a larger number of subscribers to be handled and provide more efficient service while taking into consideration a large group of connections rather than a single mobile station.

In regard to Claims 2, 8, 10, 20 and 28, Lindskog teaches assigning a third sub-code derived from the first code to support a second supplemental channel to the second subscriber station. (*Para 28, 30, 37 and 44*)

In regard to Claim 3, 11, 21, and 29, it is obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that in a communication system at any time there can be a mobile in soft hand off and one not in soft handoff. There can also be none in soft handoff. The allocation of a code to a mobile in soft-hand off would only constitute holding the resource in the first cell for additional time. (Para 65)

In regard to Claims 4, 9, 17-18, 22 and 27 Lindskog teaches separating communications to the second subscriber station into first and second portions.

Spreading the first portion of the communication with the second code and spreading the second portion of the communications with the second sub-code. (spreading codes are assigned to a forward-link connections from a first set of orthogonal odes as long as

there are codes available in the first set. When no more codes are available, codes from a second set Are assigned. Para 4)

In regard to Claim 5, 12, 15, 23 and 30, Lindskog teaches he first sub-code comprises a plurality of concatenated copies of the first code. (Para 28)

In regard to Claim 6, 13, 24 and 31, Lindskog teaches signaling to the second subscriber the first code. (Para 27-30)

#### Conclusion

3. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to ERIC ELCENKO whose telephone number is (571)272-8066. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 7:30 AM through 5:00 PM.

Application/Control Number: 10/723,688 Page 6

Art Unit: 2617

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Duc Nguyen can be reached on (571) 272-7503. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

ee

/Duc Nguyen/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2617